



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/713,712	11/14/2003	Hiu-Ming Eric Lam	MSFT125569	2286
38991 7590 06/06/2007 CHRISTENSEN, O'CONNOR, JOHNSON, KINDNESS, PLLC 1420 FIFTH AVENUE SUITE 2800 SEATTLE, WA 98101-2347			EXAMINER GORTAYO, DANGELINO N	
			ART UNIT 2168	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 06/06/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Application No. 10/713,712	Applicant(s) LAM ET AL.	
	Examiner Dangelino N. Gortayo	Art Unit 2168	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 26 February 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
 b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☒ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
- (a) ☒ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
 (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
 (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
 (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).


4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
 5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
 6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
 7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☒ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
 The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
 Claim(s) allowed: _____.
 Claim(s) objected to: _____.
 Claim(s) rejected: 1-31.
 Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
 9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
 10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See Continuation Sheet.
 12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____
 13. ☐ Other: _____.


TIM VO
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

Continuation of 3. NOTE: These issues include the limitation "a method for a query component to specify a particular subset of a data store component" in the proposed amendment of claim 13. The scope of independent claim 13 has been changed with the amendment above, and would require further consideration and/or search.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: In regards to the 35 USC 101 rejection of claims 1-5, and 7-11, the Examiner agrees with the Applicant's representative as per the informal telephone interview and the 35 USC 101 rejection is withdrawn. However, the 35 USC 101 rejection of claims 13-14 stand as is because, as per the explanation above, the proposed amendment to claim 13 changes the scope of the invention.

In regards to the 35 USC 112, second paragraph rejection of claim 1, Examiner agrees with the Applicant's representative as per the informal telephone interview and the 35 USC 112, second paragraph rejection is withdrawn.

In regards to the arguments pertaining to the 35 USC 102(e) and 35 USC 103(a) rejections, the Examiner respectfully disagrees.

As per independent claim 23, the applicant argues that Tamboli does not teach "an object oriented heterogeneous data store interface comprising at least one data store object component corresponding to at least one of said at least on data store objects stored in said at least one data store" and a user interface corresponding to data stored in at least one native repository, Examiner respectfully disagrees.

As disclosed in page 4 of the Final Action, data stored in at least one native repository is taught in Figure 1, column 6 lines 53-60, and column 7 lines 16-35, wherein multiple data repositories store data in multiple internal data formats. The user interface of Tamboli is part of a data integration application that communicates with adaptors, which are implementations of interfaces between repositories, transfer managers, and spiders (column 8 lines 27-50). The user interface is utilized by a user to access transformation services to transform data between various data repositories using respective data adaptors (column 10 lines 32-58).

Applicant argues that Tamboli does not teach "a data store object design graphical user interface configured to enable building of a graphical representation of each data object corresponding to at least one data store object component of the object-oriented heterogeneous data store interface. The examiner respectfully disagrees, and points to the cited section of the Final Action, wherein a user interface is installed and operated on a web server, and is accessible to users, and display data to a user, including query prompts and query results.

Applicant argues that Tamboli does not teach a data store object source code generator capable of generating object oriented programming language source code for each data store object component of the object-oriented heterogeneous data store interface. In regards to the argument, Examiner respectfully disagrees. In column 16 lines 13-39, a translator is disclosed that can convert from a native format specific for a data repository to a dynamic common format. Column 19 lines 47-67 teach that mappings are created for specific adaptors, which can be XML stylesheets for transformation purposes (Figure 17a-17i and column 21 lines 41-65)

As per independent claim 1, applicant argues that Tamboli does not teach each provider plug-in comprises at least one provider component configured with a behavior conforming to the query component behavior specification of the provider interface. In regards to the argument, Examiner respectfully disagrees. Column 8 lines 27-50 teach that adaptors are interfaces between native repository formats and a common dynamic format, and is configured to call a transformation service and to return and insert data into repositories, in response to a query.

As per independent claim 13, applicant argues that Prompt does not teach instantiating a first query component in a plurality of query components of an object-oriented heterogeneous data store interface, each query component of the object-oriented heterogeneous data store interface having an add expression behavior. In regards to the argument, Examiner respectfully disagrees. In addition to the cited section of Prompt in the Final Office Action, which shows how queries are addressed from clients and are processed via different commands, column 5 lines 51-56, column 27 lines 27-51 and column 31 lines 3-26 of Prompt teach how commands specify searching for information needed in a translation system in response to user query or directions. Column 27 lines 27-51 also teaches that the command can be a way to modify the structure of a schema used for translation, including adding attributes to be mapped, according to user input and queries.

Applicant argues that Prompt does not teach adding a query expression to the first query component with the add expression behavior of the first query component. In regards to the argument, Examiner respectfully disagrees. Column 28 line 39 - column 29 line 15 of Prompt teach how the database query is generated by taking the user-specified attributes and descriptions and adding it to the location of data as specified in the query.

It is respectfully submitted that all limitations of the present application are fully covered in the Final Office Action.